

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

_____)	
[PARTY NAME],)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	Civil Action No. [#] (EGS)
v.)	
)	
[PARTY NAME],)	
)	
Defendant.)	
_____)	

SCHEDULING ORDER

Attorneys of record shall read this Scheduling Order in its entirety upon receipt and are responsible for ensuring that members of the attorney's staff are also familiar with and follow these procedures and the Local Civil Rules. The failure of a party or attorney to comply with the provisions of this Order or the Local Civil Rules will be viewed with disfavor and may result in the imposition of sanctions. The parties are advised that requests for extensions of time will also be viewed with disfavor and will not be granted as a matter of course. Furthermore, in view of this Court's limited resources, no one should contact chambers by telephone absent exigent circumstances.

Pursuant to the joint report filed according to Local Civil Rule 16.3 and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26, it is hereby **ORDERED** that:

(1) The parties are exempt from filing initial disclosures under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(a)(1) because this is an action for review on an administrative record. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(a)(1)(B)(i). The parties agree that no discovery is necessary.

(2) Defendants shall produce the administrative record to the parties and the Court by no later than [DATE]. Any objections to the administrative record shall be filed by no later than [DATE].

(3) If, at any point in time, the parties desire to have a mediator from the District Court's mediation program appointed to assist with settlement discussions, the parties shall electronically file a motion captioned "Joint Motion for Appointment of a Mediator."

(4) Any motion that does not comply with Local Civil Rule 7(m) may be, *sua sponte*, denied by the Court. See Local Civ. R. 7(m) ("Before filing any nondispositive motion in a civil action, counsel shall discuss the anticipated motion with opposing counsel, either in person or by telephone, in a good faith effort to determine whether there is any opposition to the relief sought and, if there is opposition, to narrow the areas of

disagreement. The duty to confer also applies to non-incarcerated parties appearing pro se. A party shall include in its motion a statement that the required discussion occurred, and a statement as to whether the motion is opposed.”).

(5) Counsel with primarily case responsibility shall appear at any hearings scheduled by the Court.

(6) The parties shall adhere to the following briefing schedule: Plaintiff’s Motion for Summary Judgment shall be filed no later than [DATE]. Defendant’s Combined Cross-Motion for Summary Judgment and Opposition to Plaintiff’s Motion for Summary Judgment shall be filed no later than [DATE]. Plaintiff’s Combined Opposition to Defendant’s Cross-Motion for Summary Judgment and Reply in support of its Motion for Summary Judgment shall be filed no later than [DATE]. Defendant’s Reply in support of its Cross-Motion for Summary Judgment shall be filed no later than [DATE].

(7) In view of this Court’s limited resources, no one should contact chambers by telephone absent exigent circumstances. In the event, however, that it is absolutely necessary to communicate with Judge Sullivan’s staff regarding this case, chambers may be contacted at 202-354-3260, or the courtroom deputy, Carol Votteler, may be contacted at 202-354-3152. The parties are directed not to call chambers without opposing

counsel on the line. Failure to comply with this provision will be viewed with extreme disfavor by the Court.

(8) All dates in this Order are firm and may not be altered by the parties without seeking leave of the Court. Any request for an extension of time shall be made by filing a motion and shall state whether any prior extensions of time have been granted and whether the extension will impact any other scheduled dates. A motion for extension of time that is filed on the date that a filing is due will be viewed with extreme disfavor.

(9) Counsel are instructed to read the D.C. Circuit's opinion in *Jackson v. Finnegan, Henderson, Farabow, Garrett & Dunner, et al.*, 101 F.3d 145, 152 (D.C. Cir. 1996) ("In implementing a scheduling order at the beginning of a case and insisting on its reasonable observance during litigation, the district court acted in a manner consistent with the Supreme Court's and Congress' concern for the fair and efficient administration of justice.").

It is **FURTHER ORDERED** that the Clerk of the Court is not required to provide hard copies of any pleading filed electronically in the above captioned case to supernumerary attorneys of a law firm who have not entered their appearance on the electronic case filing system ("ECF") and registered for a password granting them access to electronic dockets.

SO ORDERED.

Signed: Emmet G. Sullivan
United States District Judge
[DATE]